

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claim 9 is newly added.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Rather than rewriting claim 8, Applicant has added a new claim 9 that incorporates subject matter from claims 1 and 8. Thus, claim 9 is now an allowable independent claim.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,186,399 B1 to Stern et al, hereinafter "Stern". Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 provides a mounting arrangement for a laser source and at least one auxiliary component associated therewith. The laser source and the auxiliary component are mounted on a submount having a general plane of extension. The at least one auxiliary component is mounted on the submount so that a longest dimension of the at least one auxiliary component is at least substantially orthogonal to the general plane of the submount.

Stern discloses an integrated scanner formed on a common substrate (abstract). Stern discloses a scanner 100 including a laser diode 112 and a detector 128 mounted on a laser submount 126 (col. 2, lines 51-54). As shown in Figures 1 and 2, detector 128 is mounted on a surface plane of submount 126, and has three dimensions.

It is clear that the longest of the three dimensions of the detector 128 disclosed in Stern in Figures 1 and 2, and cited by the Office Action, has a longest dimension that is **parallel** to the surface plane of submount 126. Therefore, Stern does not disclose a "mounting arrangement for a laser source . . . wherein said at least one auxiliary

component is mounted on said submount so that a longest dimension of said at least one auxiliary component is **substantially orthogonal** to said general plane of said submount," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Stern fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Stern.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as clearly anticipated by Stern is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,287 B1 to Kner et al, hereinafter "Kner". Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Kner discloses a tunable semiconductor laser assembly that includes a laser 112 and photodetectors 124 and 128 (col. 8, lines 39-44). As shown in Figures 10, 13 and 18, photodetectors 124 and 128 and laser 112 are mounted on a surface of a component 126. Figures 10, 13 and 18 show two dimensions of photodetectors 124 and 128.

It is clear from Figures 10, 13 and 18 of Kner that the shorter of the two shown dimensions of photodetectors 124 and 128 is orthogonal to the surface of the component 126. Thus, the longest dimension of photodetectors 124 and 128 must be **parallel** to the surface plane of component 126. Therefore, Kner does not disclose a "mounting arrangement for a laser source . . . wherein said at least one auxiliary component is mounted on said submount so that a longest dimension of said at least one auxiliary component is **substantially orthogonal** to said general plane of said submount," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Kner fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Kner.

Claims 3, 4 and 7 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 3, 4 and 7 are also patentable over Kner.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as clearly anticipated by Kner is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kner. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Kner fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Kner.


Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2, 5 and 6 are also patentable over Kner.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kner is overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 5 and 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/17/05



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401